



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

tol

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,193	02/13/2004	Mehmet K. Tanacan	0267-001-1800	5787
31108	7590	07/25/2005	EXAMINER	
PAUL J. SUTTON, ESQ., BARRY G. MAGIDOFF, ESQ. GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP 200 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10166			GUSHI, ROSS N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/777,193

Applicant(s)

TANACAN ET AL.

Examiner

Ross N. Gushi

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/13/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 7/13/05 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the contact first and second ends must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ericson et al. ("Ericson") in view of Mahnke et al. ("Mahnke").

Regarding claim 1, Ericson discloses an electrical connector comprising first and second contacts (including first and second ends) coupled to the connector and adapted to slidably engage corresponding contacts in a mating connector for receiving electrical power; a module 30 of insulating material adapted to be coupled to the electrical connector; indexing means (e.g. screw 58) coupled to the module to orient the module relative to the electrical connector; and a series circuit having light emitting means 110 supported by the module of insulating material and coupled across the first and second contacts for indicating the if the second ends of the contacts are connected to a live source. To the extent that one might argue that Ericson does not disclose explicitly that the circuit is a series circuit, Ericson notes that the preferred circuit is disclosed in Mahnke. Mahnke discloses the series circuit including the light emitting means. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to use the circuit disclosed in Mahnke in the Ericson device as suggested in Ericson, col. 4, lines 55-60. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to have the device operate as intended as suggested in Ericson.

Per claim 2, the first and second contacts are prongs of a male plug or contacts of a female connector.

Per claim 3, the module of insulating material is adapted to be located within the electrical connector and attached to a portion of the connector coupled to the prongs or contacts.

Claims 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ericson and Mahnke as in claim 3 in view of Guss, III et al. ("Guss"). Ericson uses a neon lamp instead of an LED. Guss discloses a power indicator connector and notes the interchangeability of LEDs and neon lamps (see Guss, col. 1, lines 45-55, col. 3, lines 15-20). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to replace the Ericson lamps with LEDs as suggested by Guss. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been for example cost, availability, simplification of assembly, etc., such motivations being well known in the art.

Claim 5-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ericson, Mahnke, and Guss as in claim 4 in view of Greene et al. ("Greene"). Ericson/Mahnke do not disclose a resistor and a diode in series with the LED. Greene discloses a power indication circuit module 60 including a resistor 54 and a diode 56 in series with the LED 58. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify the Ericson circuit (As suggested by Ericson, col. 4, lines 50-55) to be the circuit disclosed by Greene. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been for example to simplify the circuitry and/or simplify the manufacturing and assembly of the device, such motivation being well known in the art (Ericson notes that rudimentary

indicator circuits including a resistor, diode, and lamp are already well known in the art, col. 1, lines 10-15).

Per claim 6, the series circuit is connected directly to the prongs of the plug or contacts of the connector.

Per claim 7, Ericson discloses a window 38 located to allow light from the LED to pass therethrough.

Per claim 8, Ericson discloses a lens 90 located in the window.

Per claim 9, the lens located in the window is clear.

Regarding claim 10, the Ericson lens may be clear instead of colored. Green discloses colored windows 74. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to color the Ericson lens as desired as suggested by Greene. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to facilitate identification of the device as taught in Greene (col. 4, lines 25-30) and as is well known in the art.

Per claim 11, Ericson discloses yieldable conducting members 112 positioned to connect the ends of the series circuit to the first and second contacts.

Per claim 12, the yieldable members comprise conductive springs
(springs are defined as : An elastic device . . . that regains its original shape after being compressed or extended.¹).

Per claim 13, the conductive springs contact the top ends of the prongs or contacts.

¹ *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Third Edition* copyright © 1992 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Electronic version licensed from INSO Corporation; further reproduction

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/13/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As best understood by the examiner, applicant argues that somehow applicant's claims are patentable because applicant does not claim or disclose additional features (ground fault detection) which are disclosed in Mahnke/Ericson. This does not distinguish what is claimed here from what is disclosed in Mahnke/Ericson. The Mahnke/Ericson lamp glows when the prongs are connected to a live source, just as claimed and disclosed by applicant.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ross Gushi whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 2833

2005. If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley, can be reached at 571-272-2800 extension 33. The phone number for the Group's facsimile is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ROSS GUSHI
PRIMARY EXAMINER